

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 93 04:30:15 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #332  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 12 Sep 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    332

Today's Topics:

    Automatic Forwarding via NOS/SMTP, what's legal?  
        Codeless Technician (3 msgs)  
    Credit for Extra on Commercial License? "911"  
FCC doesn't care; was: Credit for Extra on Commercial License?  
    No Frills License Application (3 msgs)  
        RIF RAFF (2 msgs)  
    Wayne w2nsd and 73 Magazine (was:RIF (sic) RAFF)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1993 03:07:36 GMT  
From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Automatic Forwarding via NOS/SMTP, what's legal?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I am in the process of setting up an NOS (TCP/IP) system via packet.

I am a one-person consulting firm with a unix system, a small ethernet lan,  
and mail/news access.

I have set up a system to run NOS. It has an ethernet card and a tnc.  
I can receive mail and news via the unix system's modem and forward  
(over the ethernet) to the NOS system. Up until this point it is all on  
private (if you can call the internet private) networks. So I can send,  
receive, or forward messages of types that are forbidden on packet.

I can forward mail to users logged into the NOS' system bbs via smtp and the ethernet. I can also forward mail to users logged onto other NOS systems via the packet smtp network and to normal packet users via an smtp/packet gateway (which I could be if I wanted to).

The tnc side of the network would be on 2 meters.

All of this can be done automatically with no intervention on my part.

My question is MAY I do this?

Do I have to monitor the email to make sure it contains no forbidden messages?

If the email is delivered to my bbs and is picked up by logging onto it, do I need to monitor it.

If I need to monitor it, do I need to do so before forwarding, or may I monitor it at my convenience and stop forwarding mail for people who violate the law?

Obviously, if I have to monitor it I probably will not do it at all.

What about netnews?

Thanks for your answers.

73

Geoff.

--

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N3OWJ

(215) 242-8712

gsm@mendelson.com or uunet!gsm001!gsm

-----  
Date: 10 Sep 93 09:57:58 EDT  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Codeless Technician  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

>ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>> Why do you feel that the best way to get more freedom to enjoy ham  
>> radio the way YOU like is to insult others for the way they do things.

>> I enjoy CW. I can do that! I don't think that anyone should insult me  
>> by calling me an old fart just because I do.

>The problem is there are those who insist that the ability to operate high  
>speed Morse is the only way that a person can show that deserve to be  
>hams. Flaming the Morse fans is one reaction to this attitude.

Perhaps so, but it is the least useful reaction. I don't get on this forum and insult those who do not want to operate CW. In fact, in spite of my personal interest, I have repeatedly stressed that if we don't welcome all hams into the hobby we will see a hobby so badly divided that it falls apart. There are many coded hams who feel the same. It is just plain wrong, and harmful to the hobby, to insult all code-loving hams just because there are a few who are unkind to non code-loving hams. It is just as wrong to paint all Technicians with the same brush used to tar and feather the few real lids that manage to get thier licenses.

>Requiring the knowledge of Morse at 5 wpm should be enough requiring 13 or  
>20 wpm Morse is harassment. There are many operating modes possible in  
>the amateur service, why is it necessary to show a high level of  
>proficiency in one mode (morris) and ignoring all the other modes.

Now, Rod, I hope my disagreement with this will not be taken as a blanket condemnation of the no-code license. IMHO, if we are going to have a Morse-code requirement at all (that is a different flame-fest), it makes sense to require that this be a permanent skill. I just don't think that learning Morse at 5 WPM will really stick. (I know this be seeing the number of Novices and Techs who have just plain forgotten the code. I also know a few 13 WPM folks who haven't used code in years, but they can still bumble along at 8 WPM or so.) I also think that, if we are going to have a Morse-code requirement at all, that it makes sense to require real proficiency. CW doesn't really get enjoyable until you hit at least 10 WPM or so, and I don't think I could describe 5 WPM as proficiency. Whether it needs to be 20 WPM or not is certainly wide open for debate (especially where, under the current rules, one must learn CW at 20 WPM to get more phone priveleges).

But either way, it is not me, you or anyone else except the FCC who ultimately sets the requirements to obtain an Amateur Radio license. If you seek change, it is the FCC that must be influenced. If you seek change, work actively and constructively for that change. Even if people disagree with you, most will respect your right to constructively work toward you goal. If you choose a destructive tack instead of a constructive one, you still have the right to do so. Of course, the number of people who will respect you for it are low (and you really don't want that kind of respect anyway), and you are far less likely to actually effect the desired changes at all.

I want to say to all who are ready to condemn other hams for their views or proficiency on CW, or use of repeaters, or use of digital modes or ... please, enjoy your version of ham radio and leave others to enjoy theirs. There really is enough room for us all. In fact, I am glad that not all hams want to operate CW at the same time; there is room for my QRP signal in between the big guns. :-).

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

```
-----
Ed Hare, KA1CV                      ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111                "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice             if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor         back in the box." Colleen
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing
-----
```

-----

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 93 22:18:31 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Codeless Technician  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <a05L0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>

>> Why do you feel that the best way to get more freedom to enjoy ham  
>> radio the way YOU like is to insult others for the way they do things.  
>> I enjoy CW. I can do that! I don't think that anyone should insult me  
>> by calling me an old fart just because I do.

>

>I second the motion.

>

The problem is there are those who insist that the ability to operate high speed Morse is the only way that a person can show that deserve to be hams. Flaming the Morse fans is one reaction to this attitude.

Requiring the knowledge of Morse at 5 wpm should be enough requiring 13 or 20 wpm Morse is harassment. There are many operating modes possible in the amateur service, why is it necessary to show a high level of proficiency in one mode (morris) and ignoring all the other modes.

--

Rod Anderson NONZO | "I do not think the United States government  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
 | fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
Clinton, Gore, gone in four | Slick Willie the Compassionate

-----

Date: 10 Sep 1993 12:32 EDT  
From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!  
skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Technician  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <XmRN0B1w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>, cowan@balsam.pinetree.org (Darin Cowan) writes...

>robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>

>> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>>

>> > Why do you feel that the best way to get more freedom to enjoy ham  
>> > radio the way YOU like is to insult others for the way they do things.  
>> > I enjoy CW. I can do that! I don't think that anyone should insult me  
>> > by calling me an old fart just because I do.

>>

>> I second the motion.

>

>ehare is absolutely right. Just because someone likes CW, doesn't mean  
>they're an old fart.

>

>COnversely, just because some people like CW is no reason to make it a legal  
>requirement for advancement of license privileges. Nor should people who  
>do not wish to operate CW be insulted for their choice.

>

>Respect is a 2 way street.

>

>

>--

>Darin Cowan - cowan@balsam.pinetree.org | I just try to make people's  
> VE3 OIJ | lives a little more surreal

>

I think Darin has hit this whole issue right on the head. A large group of people who enjoy CW (and have every right to enjoy it) have actively lobbied to make CW speed an Amateur Radio Discriminator. This have given this group a veto right on Ham Radio as a whole and not just on CW. Generally, this is done for the reason of restricting spectrum for themselves because

more people might mean less of their favorite spectrum for themselves.

This is not the way that evaluation criteria should be selected. Much less personal and more relevant analysis is required. For example, if incentive licensing is useful, we need to undertake more detailed and less partial analysis of what factors we really need to differentiate among the groups.

I believe the less strident views about not making code speed the differentiator were advocating just such an analysis. These people did not say that, given incentive licensing (which by the way I don't like), there should be no differentiators or knowledge demonstration. The discussion went haywire when the extreme anti-no code cretins attacked the intelligence, ancestry, morality and wisdom of people who felt code speed (indeed code itself) should not be the group discriminator.

I personally believe that the initial discussions on testing were very useful and informative and appropriate to the newsgroup. However, the name calling is just a total waste of time.

Erich  
N30XM

-----  
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1993 09:04:08 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Credit for Extra on Commercial License? "911"  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep9.172331.29237@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, Jim Jaskie  
<jim\_jaskie@tempeqm.sps.mot.com> wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-080993100617@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com> Mike Waters,  
> rcrw90@email.mot.com writes:

> >  
> >The shipboard argument is that satellite based systems are replacing the  
> >need for radio ops. You just call "911" if the ship is sinking I guess

>  
>  
> This sounds kind of silly, doesn't it? "Just dial 911." However, in  
> 1996 (I think) the first Iridium(tm) satellite goes up, with the full  
> system operational in 1998.

Actually this is effect at present with the current COMSAT networks, except that it is extremely high cost (>\$10K for equipment, \$5-10/minute of call), but does give dial service. As far as I know the emergency code is

different, but the principle is the same. There are also automated "Mayday" callers for standard HF/VHF radios.

What I actually had in mind though was the current practice of coastal shipping and pleasure boaters to carry along a cellular phone! The Coast Guard now gets quite a few distress reports this way from coastal areas.

The Iridium system will make the whole thing much easier to use and \*much\* more economical as well as being worldwide.

As Jim pointed out though there are governments in the world to whom free flow of information is extremely threatening. Iridium or not, I think the history of the Soviet Empire in Eastern Europe as well as Tiananmen (sp) Square illustrate the impracticality of trying to restrict communication. A lot of governments are not giving up easily though ...

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----  
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1993 08:59:55 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: FCC doesn't care; was: Credit for Extra on Commercial License?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep9.160617.28159@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) wrote:

They  
> just don't have the funding to be able to do much about it. And with Radio  
> Shack, J.C. Whitney, Penney's, and probably eventually K-Mart and Walgreens  
> selling ham gear and/or GMRS radios it's going to be virtually impossible to  
> enforce licensing rules anyway. They (FCC) will have to concentrate on keeping  
> the important bands (public safety, military, aircraft) free of encroachment by  
> the masses and that will likely take all their funding.

I recently bought a Marine Band hand held at Price Club, as far as I know they have never handled ham or CB gear!

A Marine license essentially requires only payment of the \$35 fee with no operator license required for U.S. operation.

I don't see a problem with this - do you?

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----

Date: 11 Sep 1993 11:35:56 GMT  
From: news.service.uci.edu!ucivax!news.claremont.edu!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: No Frills License Application  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The  
W5GYJ  
No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations  
Amateur Radio License Application Form

This is an application for a station license in the Amateur Radio Service. It requires a truthful answer to a single question. Giving a false or misleading answer to this question is perjury. By signing below, you certify that you are aware of the legal penalties for perjury.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_

Operation in the Amateur Radio Service is governed by Part 97 of the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. By signing below, you indicate that you have read and understand the provisions of Part 97 and agree to abide by them.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_

Costs for the administration of the Amateur Radio Service are defrayed in part by licensing fees. The fee for a station license is \$100 per year. Please enclose \$100 with your application for the first year's fee.

-----  
Date: 11 Sep 93 21:35:10 GMT  
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No Frills License Application  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

> The  
> W5GYJ  
> No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations  
> Amateur Radio License Application Form

You know, the scary thing is, if the whining, snivelling



#define NASAL\_WHINE ON

Why do I have to do the code??!?!?! Its out daaaaaaated.....

#define NASAL\_WHINE OFF

folks get their way, basically this is exactly what they would be filling out.

Naturally, you would only have to pay the \$100 if you were an european-decendent white male, since, as everyone knows, they are the source of all evil in the world today... The rest would just have to mail it in without the fee.

MD

--

--

-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -  
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com - Providence Firefighters Association:  
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz - We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet

-----

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 93 22:27:00 CDT

From: library.ucla.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!  
math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!  
robert@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: No Frills License Application

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> This is an application for a station license in the Amateur Radio  
> Service. It requires a truthful answer to a single question. Giving  
> a false or misleading answer to this question is perjury. By  
> signing below, you certify that you are aware of the legal penalties  
> for perjury.

>

> Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_

>

> Operation in the Amateur Radio Service is governed by Part 97 of  
> the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.  
> By signing below, you indicate that you have read and understand  
> the provisions of Part 97 and agree to abide by them.  
>  
> Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Costs for the administration of the Amateur Radio Service are defrayed  
> in part by licensing fees. The fee for a station license is \$100  
> per year. Please enclose \$100 with your application for the first  
> year's fee.

Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?

--Robert

-----  
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 93 21:51:16 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: RIF RAFF  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <26nkn8INN8pa@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>Jay.Maynard@f121.n324.z1.fidonet.org (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>>Wayne Green was convicted of tax evasion several years back.  
>>Personally, I think we'd be better off without that prophet of baseless doom  
>>and gloom...  
>Ah, so you'd like to use government powers to silence the voice of  
>someone whose opinions you disagree with?

So, have you collected your medal in the long jump to a conclusion Olympic event?

There's nothing that I said to connect those two statements. The first was explaining someone else's posting about how they thought that felony convictions should be disqualifying for amateur licenses. The second was expressing my opinion about Mr. Green. That I believe that amateur radio would be better off without him does NOT mean that I agree that the government should silence him.

>Feh.

Feh yourself.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I liked [OS/2] so much, in fact, that I went to work for the company.  
I couldn't afford to buy it." -- Steve Withers

-----

Date: 10 Sep 1993 12:07:30 -0700  
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: RIF RAFF  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(Douglas R. MacKintosh) writes:

>You must be one of the people that he offends regularly. (ie - either old,  
>a smoker, fat, lazy, anti-no-code or such like). Wayne may be opinionated,  
>but  
>he makes many very valid points in his monthly diatribe. You seem to disagree  
>with his prognosis of the future of amateur radio. What makes you think it'll  
>be so great? We are going to lose some of our bands, it is merely a matter  
>of time. Just because you disagree with him is no reason to want him off the  
>air.

Jay Maynard writes:

\*He's offended me regularly for 20 years, long before I reached my current  
\*physical dimensions. His unrelenting predictions of disaster for amateur radio  
\*- every last one of them not borne out in the end - may sell magazines, but  
\*they do nothing for the service. Ever since I can remember, he's been  
\*predicting the Death of Amateur Radio and Technical Innovation in America, all  
\*because of incentive licensing. Ferchrissakes, that decision was made 25 years  
\*ago! Drop it already!

\*

\*As I said, amateur radio would be better off without him.

\*

\*(Yes, tax evasion is a felony in the US.)

I say:

I am greatly amused by your apparent enthusiasm for being offended. I,  
for example, only read a highly offensive magazine for 3 or 4 years  
before I tire of the self-abuse and move on. 8-)

On the subject of "Technical Innovation in America";

I am now enjoying my second pass through ham radio after a 20 year  
break. Back then my equipment was all made in America. I don't recall  
seeing anything that was not American in other folks shacks.

Maybe it was there but there must not have been much.

Now most equipment seems to come from somewhere else. Maybe Green was  
not so far wrong on that count.

I think I read recently that there are 300,000 or so Hams. I hope that

number is low! If that is all the clout we have got we may see dark days ahead. The National Rifle Association has over 3 million members and the number of firearm owners in this country is many times that. These folks are having a GREAT deal of difficulty protecting their hobby, not to mention their rights. And they have the Second Amendment to the Constitution for support.

RE: Drop it already!

No way! If he thinks he is right and wishes to argue the point, this IS America. Freedom of the press, 1st amendment, ect!

Just because it was decided 25 years ago does not mean it should not be questioned.

Besides, SOMEBODY is needed to balance the High and Mighty

ARRL, (all bend over, err, bow)!

RE: tax evasion in America

In the era of President and Mr. Clinton, tax evasion may become a badge of honor. 8-)

Predicted joke of the mid-nineties;

How do you spot a tax evader at the supermarket?

He's the one NOT using foodstamps!

73

Gene

KB7WIP

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares  
are destined to plow for those who don't.  
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: [genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere](mailto:genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere)

-----  
Date: 9 Sep 93 22:49:46 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!dragon!nj8j!ben@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Wayne w2nsd and 73 Magazine (was:RIF (sic) RAFF)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@hwking.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

> at last count w2nsd was involved in a heckuva lot of other things besides  
> radio -- i wouldn't be too surprised to find that cassidy is ghostwriting his  
> column or that wayne paid for some AI program that writes columns for him.  
> since wayne doesn't have the time for radio (i guess he's into running record  
> stores/music businesses now), he's not in touch with the world on what's goin  
> on. that's probably why you get the same editorial content in the editorials

> over and over and over again.

That's certainly true. I started reading 73 back in '69, even before I got my ticket, and have a fairly complete set of 73 from summer '70 thru sometime in the mid-80's. I used to enjoy Wayne's diatribes, even when I didn't agree with him. Nowadays, it's just boring, mainly because, as you say, it's just the same thing over and over.

> the current 73 mag folks just don't seem to have the lust for the hobby these  
> days. it's a dead pasttime for them so they work to make it a dead pasttime  
> for others?

What I've noticed most about 73 is that it doesn't have the variety it used to. Used to be, in any given issue you'd probably find everything from theory articles to wacky humor(anyone remember K1YSD?). Just about any ham would find something in each issue that he/she would like, if the editorial content didn't put him/her off. Last time I looked at 73, that no longer seemed to be true. And that's about the point where I decided it was no longer worth the subscription.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J          | "All that is not eternal is |
| AX.25:  NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA |   eternally out of date." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us          |           C. S. Lewis |
+-----+-----+
```

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #332

\*\*\*\*\*